

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

PATENT TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT LAW
1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE
SEVENTH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114-2579
TELEPHONE (216) 861-5582
FAX (216) 241-1666 AND (216) 241-5147

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 09 2004
OFFICIAL

DATE: April 9, 2004

TO: U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

ATTN.: Examiner Jurie Yun

FACSIMILE NO.: 703/308-7722 872-9306

FROM: Timothy E. Nauman / Ann M. Skerry

RE: Our Ref.: GECZ 2 00450 (LD 11332)
Serial No. 09/731,212

TOTAL PAGES: 6 (including cover sheet)

Please call us immediately at (216) 861-5582 if this transmission is incomplete or illegible.

COMMENTS

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission include information from the firm of Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP that might be legally privileged and/or confidential. The information is intended for the use of only the individual or entity named on this cover sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, or distribution of these documents, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this transmission, is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, these documents should be returned to this firm as soon as possible, and we ask that you notify us immediately by telephone so we can arrange for their return to us without cost to you.

N:\GECZ\200450\cmk0002788V001.doc

No. 0741 P. 1

Apr. 9. 2004 8:26AM Fay Sharpe

Attorney Docket No.: LD 11332
GECZ 2 00450

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Ser. No.: 09/731,212	Filed: December 6, 2000	Examiner: Jurie Yun
Art Unit: 2882	Title: GARAGE LAMP	

To the Commissioner for Patents:

Transmitted herewith is an *Amendment* in the above-identified application. The fee has been calculated as shown below.

CLAIMS AS AMENDED						
	Claims remaining after amendment		Highest Number Previously Paid For	No. of Extra Claims Present	Rate	Additional Rate
Total Claims	18	Minus	20	0	X 18	\$0.00
Indep. Claims	6	Minus	6	0	X 86	\$0.00
TOTAL					=	\$0.00

- ☒ No additional fee is required.
☐ A check in the amount of \$ _____ is attached.
☐ Charge \$ _____ to Deposit Account No. 06-0308.
☐ Applicants hereby petition the Commissioner under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and request a _____ month extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action. Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$ _____ .00 to cover the applicable extension of time fees.
☒ Applicants request any extensions of time that may be necessary and authorize the required fees be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-0308.
☒ Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0308.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

April 8, 2004
Date

Timothy E. Nauman, Reg. No. 32,283
Ann M. Skerry, Reg. No. 45,655
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216/861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that this Amendment Transmittal Letter and accompanying document(s) are being
☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT NO FEE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
☒ transmitted to facsimile number 703/308-7722 under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 on the date indicated below.
☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT FEE, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail Label No.:
Date 9 APRIL 2004

Signature <u>Cheryl M. Kobylinski</u>
Printed Name Cheryl M. Kobylinski

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF : Clifford L. Spiro, et al.
FOR : **GARAGE LAMP**
SERIAL NO. : 09/731,212
FILED : December 6, 2000
EXAMINER : Jurie Yun
ART UNIT : 2882
CONFIRMATION NO. : 8624
LAST OFFICE ACTION : January 20, 2004
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. : 11332 (GECZ 2 00450)
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

APR 09 2004

OFFICIAL

AMENDMENT C

Mail Stop – Amendment NO FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-12, 14-18, and 20 are pending in the application.
Remarks begin on page 2 of this paper.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this Paper and/or fee is being facsimile transmitted to the
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner of Patents, at (703) 308-
7722, on April 9, 2004.

By Cheryl M. Kobylinski
Cheryl M. Kobylinski

REMARKS

Reexamination of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-6, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cardwell, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 3,746,906) in view of Ferenc (U.S. Patent No. 4,866,329).

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable Cardwell, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 3,746,906) in view of Ferenc (U.S. Patent No. 4,866,329), and further in view of McBride, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,034,473).

Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, and 20 were allowed.

The Claims Distinguish over the References of Record

Claim 1 recites a high brightness lamp which includes a concave reflector. A lens covers an open end of the reflector. The lamp emits light with a beam angle which is at least 45 degrees.

The references of record do not disclose such a lamp. **Cardwell, Jr.** discloses a conventional lamp with a screw adaptor. Cardwell does not discuss the beam angle or provide any motivation for increasing the beam angle of the lamp. **Ferenc** discloses a lamp designed to be installed into an emergency vehicle. The lamp is fitted in a line of such lamps, below the roof line. The lamp of Ferenc has a lens provided with a central window 48, located next to a lamp 32, and plurality of light spreaders 44, spaced by flat areas 46. A comparatively high percentage of the light passes through the window 48 and the flats 46 between the spreaders. Such an arrangement produces a very uneven light pattern- i.e., a central narrow beam, visible at long distances, with a small proportion of the light spread to allow visibility from a wide angle. The wide angle portion of the light is not intended to provide illumination, as such, but to draw attention to the emergency vehicle. Ferenc's object is to increase the intensity of the output of the central beam. Moreover, due to the parallel arrangement of the spreaders, light hitting Ferenc's spreaders will be spread in a strip which has a length substantially longer than the width of the light strip, leaving large angles where there is little light output. This is not an issue for Ferenc, since the lamp could be oriented so the unilluminated areas are towards the sky and towards the ground.

There is no motivation to include a lens like Ferenc's, which provides such an uneven light distribution, in a conventional electric lamp with a screw thread fitting, such as that of Cardwell. Such an uneven distribution would be unacceptable in homes, offices, and the like where conventional lamps, such as Cardwell's, are commonly used.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1, and claims 2-6 and 9-10 dependent

therefrom, distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 11 recites a high brightness lamp having an end cap connected with a reflector for supporting the lamp from a ceiling socket, the end cap extending from the reflector along the axis of the lamp. A light source is positioned between a focal point of the reflector and the lens. The lamp emits light with a beam angle which is at least 45 degrees.

None of the references of record, alone or in combination, discloses such a lamp. First, there is no motivation for combining **Ferenc** with **Cardwell, Jr.** since it would not be obvious to employ a lens which provides a highly uneven beam pattern, such as **Ferenc's**, in the lamp of **Cardwell**. Second, there is no motivation for combining **McBride** with **Cardwell**. **McBride** discloses a lighting assembly designed to produce a beam of light, such as is used for the theatrical industry. **McBride** teaches that a forward light intensity of a theatrical spotlight with a parabolic reflector can be improved by positioning the light source in front of the lens. There is no motivation for increasing the forward intensity of a conventional lamp, such as that of **Cardwell's**. **McBride** teaches that this would result in a spotlight, with lower side illumination. Third, **McBride** teaches away from the present invention, since **McBride's** light source positioning would be expected to decrease, rather than widen the beam angle.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 11 distinguishes patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 12 recites a method of producing a high brightness beam of light having a wide beam angle. The method includes positioning a light source of a lamp between a focal point of a reflector and a lens, energizing the light source, and reflecting the light from the reflector. The reflector has a ratio of diameter to length along an axis of symmetry of the lamp which is from about 2.5:1 to about 3.5:1. The light is passed through a lens to increase a beam angle of the light. The lamp emits a beam of light with a beam angle which is at least 45 degrees.

None of the references of record, alone or in combination, discloses such a method. There is no motivation for combining **Ferenc** with **Cardwell, Jr.** since it would not be obvious to employ a lens which provides a highly uneven beam pattern, such as **Ferenc's**, in the lamp of **Cardwell**. Further, there is no motivation for combining **McBride** with **Cardwell**. **McBride** discloses a lighting assembly designed to produce a beam of light, such as is used for the theatrical industry. **McBride** teaches that a forward light intensity of a theatrical spotlight with a parabolic reflector can be improved by positioning the light source in front of the lens. There is no motivation for increasing the forward intensity of a conventional lamp, such as that of **Cardwell's**. **McBride** teaches that this would result in a spotlight, rather than providing general illumination.

Moreover, McBride teaches away from the present invention, since McBride's light source positioning would be expected to decrease, rather than widen the beam angle.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 12 and claims 14-15 and 18 dependent therefrom, distinguish over the references of record.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 1-12, 14-18 and 20 distinguish patentably over the references of record. An early allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP**

April 8, 2004
Date

Timothy E. Nauman

Timothy E. Nauman, Reg. No. 32,283
Ann M. Skerry, Reg. No. 45,655
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2518
216/861-5582